Fiscal Estimate - 2003 Session

	Original		Updated		Corrected		Supplem	nental
LRB	Number	03-3166/1		Introd	luction Numb	er SI	B-246	
Subje	ct							
Deadli	nes for certa	in agencies to is	sue permits					-
Fiscal	Effect							
		e Existing tions Existing	Rever Decre Rever	ease Existing	☐ Increas absorb ☐ ☑ Decreas	within age]Yes	May be po ency's bud [essible to get No
	No Local Gov Indeterminate 1. Increase Permiss 2. Decrease Permiss	e Costs sive Mandator se Costs sive Mandator	ry Permi 4. Decre	ase Revenue ssive Manda ase Revenue ssive Manda	r ∐Coui	ected ns nties ool	overnment Village Others WTCS Districts	Cities
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations GPR PRO PRO SEG SEGS								
Agenc	y/Prepared	Ву		Authorized S	ignature		D	ate
DNR/ Susan Felker-Donsing (608) 267-2769 Susan Felker-Donsing (608) 267-2769 9/2							/23/2003	

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DNR 9/23/2003

LRB Number	03-3166/1	Introduction Number	SB-246	Estimate Type	Original				
Subject									
Deadlines for certain agencies to issue permits									

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Bill Summary:

This bill requires state agencies to promulgate rules establishing periods within which the agencies intend to approve or disapprove applications for specified licenses, permits, and other approvals that the agencies issue.

The bill contains two possible scenarios if the department fails to act on applications. For some kinds of approvals, if the department fails to act, the application will be automatically approved within 30 days. The department may request an extension of the approval of 60 days. For approvals that are not subject to automatic approval, the department must refund the fees paid by the applicant if the department does not act within the period established by rule.

Fiscal Estimate:

The fiscal effects of the bill extend to a number of sections within the department.

Drinking Water and Groundwater Increase of \$1,900

The review periods that currently exist under NR 146 .04 (c) for well driller and pump installer registration, and NR 812.09 (1) for high capacity well approvals meet the rule promulgation requirements of this bill.

Letters will need to be sent to each high capacity well applicant notifying them of the allowable review period. Each of these letters will take approxiately 1/4 hour to compose, print and mail. Approximately 250 applications are received per year.

250 x .25 hrs/ application = 62.5 62.5 hours/1800 hours per FTE = .035 FTE (Program Assistant 4)

Program Assistant 4 (\$18.70/hr salary & fringe) x 2080 hours + \$5200 supplies related expenditures = \$44,100 x .035 FTE = \$1,500

Letters will need to be sent to each well driller/pump installer registrant notifying them of the allowable review period. Each of these letters will take approxiately 1/4 hour to compose, print and mail. Approximately 65 registation applications are received per year.

65 x .25 hrs/ application = 16.25 16.25 hours/1800 hours per FTE = .01 FTE (Program Assistant 4) Program Assistant 4 (\$18.70/hr salary & fringe) x 2080 hours + \$5200 supplies related expenditures = \$44,100 x .01 FTE = \$400

Fisheries and Habitat: Increase of 0.80 FTE and \$37,300

Assumptions

1. Time limits set in rule are sufficiently long (365 + 90 = 455 days) to avoid need for additional staff to speed up any decisions, to accommodate shortening of deadline for completeness reviews, and to absorb work of tracking and applicant contact. Timeframe for decisions must be set longer not only to reduce the risk of

accidental permits but also to reallocate staff time to speed up the initial completeness review deadline from 60 days to 14 days. Assume completeness review takes an average of 2 hours. For 4500 applications, completeness review will occupy approximately 25% of the time available for permit decision making steps outside of completeness. (4500x2/1825 hr = 5.0 FTE; 5 FTE/21 FTE = 25% of work time available)

- 2. Fiscal impact is data quality control on an ongoing basis and for rule-making, data and reporting system development on a one-time basis
- 3. Rule development occurs over a two year period
- 4. Data system development occurs over a two-year period
- 5. No Water Management Assistant LTEs remain in the field to do data entry and correspondence

Fiscal Impacts

- 1. 0.30 FTE for rule-development over two-year rule development period; tasks to include querying data system for accurate deadline setting, analysis of alternative deadlines and development of instructions for applicants and staff (Time estimate is based on recent rule revisions on existing deadlines.)
- 2. 0.5 FTE to revamp tracking and reporting systems over two-year rule development period (Time estimate is based on recent upgrades of data and document system in 1997 and 2002. This assumes that current data manager position can be refilled.)

Cost Calculations

[\$14.77 * 2080 hr *40.81% (fringe) + \$6400 (supplies & services) = \$49,700 (0.80 FTE) = \$37,300

Watershed Management:

USEPA approves all permits under the Federal approval requirements for water pollution discharge permits, and if USEPA finds fault with this bill they could like pull back the program from the state. The repercussions of USEPA pulling back the program could mean the loss of NR 106 federal dollars, which is approximately \$5 million annually and the associated 39.25 FTE in Watershed and 6.0 FTE in Fisheries

Waste Management:

It's possible that the Waste Management Program would lose authorization from EPA to administer federal solid and hazardous waste programs. This would result in a loss of \$2.1 million annually and the associated 23 FTE on the hazardous waste grant.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2003 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

	Original		Updated	_		Corrected			Supplemental	
LRB	Number 1	03-3166/	1		Intro	duction Nu	umber	S	SB-246	
	lines for certai	in agencies to								
annua	I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):									
II. Anr	nualized Cos	its:		4	Annualized Fiscal Impact on funds from					
<u> </u>						Increased Co	osts		Decreased Costs	
	ate Costs by									
-		s - Salaries and	Fringes			\$37,				
-	E Position Ch			+		(0.8 F		(-68.0 FTE)		
\vdash	cal Assistance	s - Other Costs		+		1,3	900		-7,100,000	
\vdash		ls or Organizati	tione	+	*****		———			
		Costs by Cate		\dashv		\$39,2	200		e_7 100 000	
		Source of Fur				Ψου,.	2001		\$-7,100,000	
GPF		300100 U	lus	\neg						
FEC				\neg			-		-7,100,000	
PRO	O/PRS			十		1,9	900		* , ,	
SEC	G/SEG-S			\neg			300			
III. Sta (e.g.,	ate Revenues tax increase	s - Complete ti , decrease in l	his only who license fee,	en pro	oposal v			ease	e state revenues	
						Increased F	Rev		Decreased Rev	
	R Taxes						\$		\$	
ь—	R Earned									
FED		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							-7,100,000	
-	O/PRS									
	G/SEG-S			_		-				
<u> </u>	OTAL State						\$		\$-7,100,000	
			NET ANNUA	LIZE	D FISC					
<u> </u>							tate	Local		
	NET CHANGE IN COSTS NET CHANGE IN REVENUE					\$-7,060,8			\$	
NETO	HANGE IN H	{EVENUE				\$-7,100,0	000		\$	
Agency/Drenoved Dr.										
							Date			
DNR/ Susan Felker-Donsing (608) 267-2769 Sus				Susa	an Felker	r-Donsing (60	8) 267-2	2769	9/23/2003	